## TALKIN, MUCCIGROSSO & ROBERTS, L.L.P.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
40 EXCHANGE PLACE
18TH FLOOR

NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10005

(212) 482-0007 PHONE (212) 482-1303 FAX WWW.TALKINLAW.COM EMAIL: INFO@TALKINLAW.COM

MARYLAND OFFICE: 5100 DORSEY HALL DRIVE SUITE 100 ELLICOTT CITY, MD 21042 410-964-0300 NEW JERSEY OFFICE:
79 MAIN STREET
SUITE ONE
HACKENSACK, NJ 07601

January 21, 2008

The Honorable Richard M. Berman United States District Judge Southern District of New York 500 Pearl Street, Room 650 New York, New York 10007

BY HAND DELIVERY AND ECF

Re: United States v. Tremaine Tazewell

07 Cr. 1035 (RMB)

Dear Judge Berman:

On August 13, 2007, United States Magistrate Judge Andrew Peck set bail for defendant as follows, "One -million dollar personal recognizance bond, cosigned by six financially responsible persons and the grandfather as a seventh person for moral suasion, further supported by \$5000,000 cash and property." Detention Hearing Transcript ("hereinafter" Det Hrg), p. 12. Magistrate Peck also required "defendant [] to live with his aunt and uncle, as noticed by – as described by Mr. Talkin<sup>1</sup>." Det Hrg, p. 13. In order to place this requirement in context, at the detention hearing, I argued that the aunt's supervision is further assurance to the Court that defendant will not be a danger to the community. Det Hrg, pp.7, 10. Defendant was released on September 26, 2007, after satisfying all of the bail conditions.

At the time of his arrest, defendant's fiancé, Takisha Womack was pregnant and she gave premature birth to their child on November 11, 2007. Since that time, defendant has been unable to live with his child because his aunt and uncle, the Bulgers, are elderly and are unable to cope with a

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Within defendant's presentment of his bail package to the Magistrate, I stated, "The package also does include home detention with electronic monitoring. He would live in one of the houses that's posted with his aunt and uncle, at 37 Esperanza Court in Baltimore, Maryland. That is in a neighborhood called "Pikesville," which is not the same neighborhood where he's been living before, it's in a different part of Baltimore." Det Hrg., p. 6.

newborn in their home and they do not have room to accommodate the baby and Ms. Womack. For this reason, defendant respectfully requests that his bail conditions be modified to permit him to live at 5407 Summerfield Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland, 21206. This home is owned by defendant and has been posted as collateral as part of defendant's Bond.

Officer Todd Stokes of Pretrial Services in Baltimore, Maryland, who monitors defendant, consents to this application as does the Government, by Assistant United States Attorney David O'Neil.

Thank you for Your Honor's consideration of this request.

V**erý** truly yours,

an ford Talkin

cc: AUSA David O'Neil by ECF

PTS Officer Todd Stokes by fax (w/out attachments)

| j  |   |
|----|---|
| 1  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |
| 2  | SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK   |
| 3  | THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, . Case No. 07-cr-01035-RMB  |
| 4  | Complainant, .  |
| 5  | . New York, New York<br>vs Monday, August 13, 2007  |
| 6  | TREMAIN ARRNEL TAZEWELL, .  |
| 7  | Defendant   |
| 8  |   |
| 9  | TRANSCRIPT OF BAIL HEARING<br>BEFORE THE HONORABLE ANDREW J. PECK                                 |
| 10 | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  |
| 11 | APPEARANCES:  |
| 12 | For the Government: Jocelyn E. Strauber, Esq. OFFICE OF THE U.S. ATTORNEY                         |
| 13 | One St. Andrew's Plaza<br>New York, New York 10007  |
| 14 | For the Defendant: Sanford N. Talkin, Esq.  |
| 15 | TALKIN, MUCCIGROSSO & ROBERTS 40 Exchange Place   |
| 16 | New York, New York 10005  |
| 17 |   |
| 18 | ·   |
| 19 |   |
| 20 | Audio Operator: Electronically Recorded   |
| 21 | by Court Personnel  |
|    | Transcription Company: Rand Reporting & Transcription, LLC 80 Broad Street, Fifth Floor           |
| 22 | New York, New York 10004<br>(212) 504-2919  |
| 23 | www.randreporting.com   |
| 24 | Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service. |
| 25 | broduced by crauscriberou service.  |

```
2
        (Proceedings commence.)
1
                        United States v. Tremain Tazewell, 07-m-
            THE CLERK:
2
   786.
3
            Counsel, please state your appearances for the record.
4
            MS. STRAUBER: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
5
   Strauber for the Government.
6
            MR. TALKIN: Sam Talkin for Mr. Tazewell.
7
   afternoon, Your Honor.
8
            THE COURT: Good afternoon. I understand we're here
9
   for a bail hearing. All right.
10
            MS. STRAUBER: That's correct, Your Honor.
11
            THE COURT: Are both counsel prepared to proceed?
12
            MR. TALKIN: Yes, Your Honor.
13
            MS. STRAUBER: Yes, Your Honor.
14
            THE COURT: All right. Proceed.
15
            MS. STRAUBER: Your Honor, the Government seeks
16
   detention in this case. As the Court is aware from the
17
   complaint, the defendant is charged with participating in a
18
   B(1)(a) heroin conspiracy, which carries a mandatory minimum
19
   sentence of ten years; this is therefore a presumption.
20
             In addition, as I'll address in greater detail in a
21
   moment, the defendant has three prior narcotics felony
22
                 Should the Government file a two prior felony
   convictions.
23
   informations in this case, the defendant would then be facing a
```

mandatory minimum term of life; should the Government file one

25

of those prior felony informations, defendant would be facing a mandatory minimum of twenty years.

Now, despite the defendant's three prior narcotics convictions, he has served relatively short periods of time for each of those, as is reflected in the presentence report, and it is largely for that reason that the Government considers the defendant a risk of flight, even in consideration of the substantial bail package that I know that defense counsel will propose, which would include home confinement with electronic monitoring. This defendant is facing a potential sentence that is really on an order greater than anything that he has served before.

In addition, the three drug convictions, I think, by themselves, in addition to the nature of the charge in this case, show the danger that this defendant poses to the community. It's also worth noting that the instant offense was committed when the defendant was on parole from his early-2002 drug conviction. He was sentenced to three to six years, but I believe served less than a year on that offense, as he was sentenced in early '02, and apparently on parole by August of '02. So this crime was committed shortly after that. In fact, in the defendant's post-arrest statement, he admitted that he had distributed heroin even after his release from prison in New York, by which I believe he was referring to his 2002 sentence.

He also made, you know, a number of other significant acknowledgements in his statements to the agents; most particularly, as I just mentioned, admitting to his distribution of heroin, although he did dispute a number of the facts as set forth in the complaint.

As the complaint indicates, it's the Government's position, not only that the defendant was involved in a heroin distribution conspiracy, but that he was one of the leaders of it, and that he directed other individuals to do a number of different things for him, including traveling to New York to obtain and test the quality of heroin that was then brought back to Baltimore to be sold there.

It's partly for that reason that the Government is of the view that even home confinement with electronic monitoring, particularly if that home confinement is to take place relatively close to the area where the defendant has resided previously and has conducted his narcotics business, is simply insufficient to protect the community from the possibility that the defendant will continue to use those people who have worked for him in the past to continue his narcotics business, even if he is personally limited by the restrictions of home confinement with electronic monitoring.

In addition, the substantial sentence that he's facing, particularly in light of the admissions that he has already made in this case. It's for that reason that the

Government does not feel that even the very substantial bail package that I know is going to be presented here today is sufficient to diminish the risk of flight posed by this defendant.

And just finally, as the pretrial services report also notes, the defendant poorly adjusted to community supervision in the past; had multiple arrests while he was on pretrial release, and has a history of violating his probation.

So, for all those reasons, it's the Government's position that detention in this case is the only way to secure the defendant's appearance in court, and to protect the safety of the community.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Talkin.

MR. TALKIN: Your Honor, I'll start with the package that I have, just so we can discuss it in that framework.

What Mr. Tazewell proposes is a one-million-dollar bond, partially secured by over \$450,000 in equity in properties; a total of six properties -- which I'll break down for Your Honor three and three, because three are owned by relatives and a close family friend; three are owned by the defendant -- as well as seven cosigners, five of which are here -- six of which are here today. They traveled all the way from Maryland to come up and support Mr. Tazewell, which is a very important factor, which we'll discuss in a minute, regarding whether he's a risk of flight, and regarding the incredible

amount of moral suasion placed on Mr. Tazewell against risk of flight.

One of the individuals -- just so Your Honor is clear on this, one of the individuals is not a financially secure individual; it's his grandfather, and he's a retired member of the merchant marine, and that's obviously there for important moral suasion, because the bond exceeds the secured property. So there's a serious consequence to all of these people, should he not return to the jurisdiction.

The package also does include home detention with electronic monitoring. He would live in one of the houses that's posted with his aunt and uncle at 37 Esperanza Court in Baltimore, Maryland. That is in a neighborhood called "Pikesville," which is not the same neighborhood where he's been living before; it's in a different part of Baltimore.

The first thing I want to direct the Court's attention to is that, if you read the complaint, the conduct that's alleged in the complaint stopped a year ago. They didn't arrest Mr. Tazewell for one year after the allegations were made. That's important because that gave Mr. Tazewell, unbeknownst to him, the opportunity to prove to this Court, not through the words of his attorney or even his own words, but through his actions, that he's not a danger to the community.

Most certainly, the Government was conducting an investigation during this year. They were watching him. The

complaint is clear that they had him identified as the individual they were looking for. They had opportunity to do wiretaps, make consent telephone calls. They had opportunity to do controlled buys. They had opportunity to have cooperators engage him in narcotics activity. It didn't happen, even though they had all of those opportunities. And the reason it didn't happen is because, in the last year, he has demonstrated to the Court that he is not a danger. When you through -- danger to the community.

When you throw on top of that, that -- two things:

One, the electronic monitoring that's going to take place and
the home detention with only leave to leave his house for
employment, but when you put that -- if that's possible --

THE COURT: Don't hold your breath on that one.

MR. TALKIN: I got you, Your Honor.

But when you put that on top, and that his aunt will be there to monitor him, who's in court here today, I think that is more than enough a set of conditions to assure the Court that he's not a danger to the community. Importantly, some of those concerns also go to risk of flight.

THE COURT: I'm less interested in risk of flight than danger. And I'm also interested, however, in the issues about prior probation violations and/or poor adjustment to

supervision.

MR. TALKIN: Your Honor, I -- the problem with addressing that is I don't -- I've only read from the report what was there. A lot of those allegations were dismissed or stetted (sic), which the closest I can come to New York is an ACD, null process, fairly pretty much what we know here in the federal system, a lot of that conduct. I didn't see on there a probation violation.

THE COURT: Well, how about, at a minimum, that while he is presumed innocent, the crime with which he's charged occurred during the period he was on parole from his 2002 sentence, number one.

And number two, the issuance of a bench warrant in connection with his 1999 possession with intent to distribute marijuana?

MR. TALKIN: I went over that bench warrant with my client, Your Honor. If you look at the timing, as best we can tell from there, it wasn't at the time of arrest. I don't know if the warrant was issued for some other reason other than not appearing in court. It's really hard to tell because, as you know, when we get the --

THE COURT: But presumably he knows.

MR. TALKIN: He doesn't know, and that's the problem.

But the one thing he does remember -- it was a long time ago, Your Honor. And if it was the -- if -- the kind of

2.4

bench warrants that -- not that they're not significant, but aren't for missing a court date, sometimes you don't even know why they're issued, so it's hard to tell.

But what he does remember is, when he found out about that, he voluntarily turned himself, he said, to the Wabash Avenue Station in Baltimore. So when he did find out about it, he did.

The other thing that, Your Honor, in the complaint it says from 2003 to 2004, and April 2006. But all the conduct in there that's alleged in the complaint all happened in 2006, which was after he was off parole. He was favorably terminated, early termination from parole. And if I -- and this is all from the report. I do not have a rap sheet. In 2005 some time. So it's not necessarily the case that the conduct happened. The allegations you have before Your Honor, any specific factual allegations all postdate parole.

So unless there's more information -- there's just a general statement of 2003, 2004. I don't know where -- I can't speak to what specifically that conduct is, allegedly. But the conduct that is in this complaint is all in the summer of 2006, which is after he was off parole.

So I -- Your Honor, the -- he's going to be under the strictest of pretrial supervision with the home detention and the electronic monitoring, so that clearly will address that concern, because there's not -- he's going to be home, he's

going to be checking in, and also he's going to be under the supervision of Ms. Bolger, who's going to watch him. She's going to watch him because she wants to watch him, and she's going to watch him because it's -- she's one of the main suretors here. She's putting up her home and also her future livelihood with her husband. They're willing to do that.

So, you know, moral suasion we talk about a lot, in terms of risk of flight. But I think it's important here in the dangerousness to the community, as well. I mean, he has a lot of reasons to stay on the straight and narrow here, and I'm certain that he's going to follow them.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Strauber.

MS. STRAUBER: Your Honor, just very briefly. While

I'm sure that the defendant's family members will do their very
best to make sure that he complies with the terms of pretrial

release, if he is released, I think it's worth noting that the
convictions that he's had in the past all, or primarily all

took place while he was living in Baltimore around these same
family members, to the extent that his home detention would be
spent in an area in a different part of Baltimore, my
understanding is it's roughly twenty minutes away. So he'd be
surrounded by the same family members that -- presumably who
have surrounded him since childhood. And unfortunately, their
influence simply has not in the past been enough to dissuade
him from this conduct, nor have three prior convictions.

And in light of that, the Government does not think that the proposed package, extremely strong though it may be, is sufficient in this case to assure the safety of the community.

THE COURT: How about the defense argument that the conduct charged in the complaint ended a year ago?

MS. STRAUBER: Well, the conduct that's set forth in the complaint, it's true, ended a year ago. But as Your Honor is aware, that doesn't mean that the Government's investigation ended a year ago. There was also an ongoing investigation in Baltimore. And I'm not going to be able to speak about the specifics of that or the evidence from that. But it's certainly not the Government's position that the defendant, on his own, ceased to be involved in this conduct outside of the time frame that's set forth in the complaint.

Also, just because it's been raised, the information provided by one of the coconspirators in this case relates, not only to conduct that occurred from April of 2006 until more recently, but also in the 2003 to 2004 time frame. So one of the coconspirators has explained, as is set forth in Paragraph 11 of the complaint, that his involvement and the direction of the defendant occurred during that time frame, as well.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. TALKIN: Just very briefly, Your Honor. Just talking about that one-year period, I just think the Court

focused on it because it's very important.

If Ms. Strauber knows any fact, a single fact that the investigation revealed that she can reveal to the Court that Mr. Tazewell was involved in any criminal activity that they observed, tape-recorded, or anything, I think she should at least, you know, in a way where I won't figure it out --

THE COURT: Well, it's not so much that. It's the issue of, if he was part of a bigger investigation, even if his conduct stopped a year ago, the Government has an interest in the broader investigation, and the arrest of him, as much as they would like to get him off the street, might have jeopardized, so --

MR. TALKIN: I understand that, but the other half --

THE COURT: All right. Okay.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR}}\xspace$  . TALKIN: The other half is that he was monitored -

16 | -

THE COURT: I get the -- I get the point.

Bail is set as follows. I am taking a chance on Mr.

Tazewell. Don't disappoint me. And if you do, you're going to be bankrupting your entire family. So, presumably, they'll keep a much closer look at you. Bail is set as follows:

One-million-dollar personal recognizance bond, cosigned by six financially responsible persons and the grandfather as a seventh person for moral suasion, further supported by \$500,000 cash and property.

Travel restricted to the Southern and Eastern

Districts of New York, the District of Maryland. Surrender of travel documents, no new applications.

Strict pretrial supervision with home incarceration with electronic monitoring. No release from the apartment except for court appearances and with advance notice to probation and their consent, meeting with counsel.

No release until all of these conditions are met.

The defendant is to live with his aunt and uncle, as noticed by -- as described by Mr. Talkin.

And I'm writing this on the form, so make sure that you're clear on this, Mr. Tazewell. Any violation of these conditions, however minor -- and I'm entering the order now -- that bail will be revoked. So any fooling around, you know, any allegation that, you know, one of your alleged coconspirators comes to the house to get instructions on further drug-dealing or whatever, that's presented to the Court, bail is revoked.

Obviously, Ms. Strauber, it will take a certain amount of time, both for the electronic monitoring to be put in place, and it usually takes a week or more for the property to be posted. So if you feel the need to go to the Part 1 Judge, feel free, obviously. But if you do, just let me know the results, one way or the other.

I must warn you, Mr. Tazewell, if you make bail on the

```
conditions that have been set, and you fail to appear in court
1
   whenever you're supposed to, or you violate any of the other
2
   conditions that have been set down, then you can be charged
3
   with the crime of bail-jumping, you and the relatives and
4
   friends who have cosigned the bond and put up the property will
5
   not only forfeit all of the cash and/or property posted, but
6
   will owe the Government the full $1 million. In addition, as I
7
   said, you could be charged with the crime of bail-jumping.
8
   That carries significant additional penalties, and you can be
9
   charged with that even if somehow the charges you are facing
10
   today were to disappear. Do you understand that?
11
            THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
12
            THE COURT: All right. Anything else on this matter?
13
            MS. STRAUBER: Nothing further from the Government,
14
                Thank you.
   Your Honor.
15
                               Thank you, Your Honor.
            MR. TALKIN: No.
16
                         Okay. We're adjourned.
            THE COURT:
17
            MR. TALKIN: Thank you, Judge.
18
        (Proceedings concluded.)
19
                                 ****
20
21
22
23
24
```

## CERTIFICATION

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Columband

January 15, 2008

Coleen Rand, AAERT Cert. No. 341 Certified Court Transcriptionist Rand Reporting & Transcription, LLC